Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 12, and 21 are amended. Claims 1-14 and 21-26 remain pending in the case. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended the Specification to correct typographical errors and are submitting an amended paragraph on a separate sheet attached herewith. The amended paragraph clarifies the Specification and claims without adding new matter.

Applicants have also amended the Drawings to correct typographical labeling errors and are submitting replacement Figs. 2 and 8 on separate sheets attached herewith. The replacement Figs. 2 and 8 clarify the Specification and claims without adding new matter.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

In paragraph 2 on page 2 or the Office Action, claims 1-5, 12-14 and 21-24 were rejected as being anticipated by Kajitani (U.S. Pat. No. 6,057,983). According to the Office Action, Kajitani discloses Applicants' invention substantially as claimed.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, but in the interest of prosecution have amended the claims to clarify the invention. Support for the amendments can be found at least on pages 5-6 and Figs. 5-7 of Applicants' Specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the invention.

Kajitani fails to disclose at least a first streamline control element located adjacent to a trailing edge at least partially between the first air bearing surface and the center portion, and a second streamline control element located adjacent to a trailing edge at least partially between the second air bearing surface and the center portion. Rather, Kajitani discloses cross rail (control) elements 16-19 at a leading edge (upstream or air-flow-in end) of a slider 10. Further, Kajitani discloses a center rail 24 having a center pad 26 at the trailing edge of the slider 10, the center pad 26 including a transducer 30. (col. 4, line 59 – col. 5, line 20; col. 6, lines 3-4; Figs. 1-5B).

Hence, the control elements of Kajitani are segments of a cross rail located in the upstream portion of the slider. Kajitani does not disclose or suggest streamline control elements in the downstream portion of the slider.

Applicants' amended claim 1 now specifically describes the streamline control elements as being located "adjacent to the trailing edge" of the slider. This is not taught or suggested by Kajitani, as all of its references to control element location indicate that the elements are located in the upstream portion of the slider.

Claims 2-5 are dependent on claim 1, and therefore inherit all of its limitations. Therefore, claims 2-5 also require the streamline control elements to be located adjacent to the trailing edge of the slider. Because this feature is specifically recited in claim 1 and not in Kajitani, withdrawal of the rejection is now respectfully requested for claims 1-5.

Applicants' amended claim 12 now describes the streamline control elements as being located "proximate to the downstream portion of the slider." This is also not taught or suggested by Kajitani, because its references to control element location indicate that the elements are located in the upstream portion of the slider.

Claims 13-14 are dependent on claim 12. Hence, claims 13-14 inherit all limitations recited in claim 12. Therefore, claims 13-14 also require the streamline control elements to be located proximate to the downstream portion of the slider. Because this feature is now recited in claim 12, withdrawal of the rejection is now respectfully requested for claims 12-14.

Applicants' amended claim 21 now describes the streamline control elements as being located "proximate to the trailing edge" of the slider. This is not taught or suggested by Kajitani, as all of its references to control element location indicate that the elements are located in the upstream portion of the slider.

Claims 22-24 are dependent on claim 21, and therefore inherit all limitations recited in that claim. Hence, claims 22-24 also require the streamline control elements to be located proximate to the trailing edge of the slider. Because this feature is now recited in claim 21, withdrawal of the rejection is now respectfully requested for claims 21-24.

Nevertheless, Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to such dependent claims and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

In paragraph 4 on page 6 or the Office Action, dependent claims 6-11 and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kajitani in view of Boutaghou et al. (US Pat. No. 6,055,127). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As discussed above, Kajitani fails to teach or suggest streamline control elements located adjacent to a trailing edge. Rather, Kajitani discloses elements that are gaps in an upstream crossbar - the exact opposite of Applicants' invention, which teaches a separate crossbar adjacent to the leading edge and streamline elements adjacent to the trailing edge. Applicants further point out that Boutaghou fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kajitani. Boutaghou fails to teach or suggest the use of streamline control elements.

Because claims 6-11 are dependent on claim 1, Applicants point out that the premise underlying the rejection of claims 6-11 must now be that some combination of Kajitani and Boutaghou (U.S. Pat. No. 6,055,127) teaches a "streamline control element located adjacent to the trailing edge" of the slider. However, Kajitani and Boutaghou are unable to support this rejection, either alone or in combination, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). For the foregoing reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants also assert that, because of their dependence on claim 21, the premise underlying the rejection of claims 25-26 must now be that some combination of Kajitani and Boutaghou teaches a streamline control element "located proximate to the trailing edge" of the slider. As has been discussed, Kajitani does not teach or suggest this element. Kajitani describes and illustrates such streamline control elements as gaps in an upstream crossbar - the exact opposite of Applicants' invention, which teaches a separate crossbar proximate to the leading edge and streamline elements proximate to the trailing edge. Applicants again point out that Boutaghou does not teach or suggest the use of streamline control elements. Thus, Kajitani and Boutaghou are unable to support this rejection, either alone or in combination, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). For the foregoing reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions or concerns regarding this communication can be addressed to the undersigned attorney, Brian H. Batzli, at (612) 332-5300.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903

Date: 24 September 2003

Brian H. Batzli
Reg. No. 32,960